



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/454,173	12/02/1999	LINDA B. VANDERWOLD	3179.01A	3447

7590 05/03/2007
JOSEPH E GERBER
WEINTRAUB GENSHLEA & SPROUL
400 CAPITAL MALL ELEVENTH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

EXAMINER

HAN, QI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/03/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/454,173		VANDERWOLD ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Qi Han		2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 49-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 49-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment dated 02/26/2007. The applicant(s) amended claims 50-55 and 63, and added new claim 64 (see the amendment: pages 2-7).

The examiner withdraws the claim objection, because the applicant amended the claim.

The examiner withdraws the claim rejection under 35 USC 101, because the applicant's arguments clarify the claimed subject matter and are persuasive (see the amendment: Remarks/Arguments on pages 12-14).

The examiner withdraws the claim rejection under 35 USC 112, because the applicant amended the corresponding claims and/or made clarification/explanation for the claims (amendment: Remarks/Arguments on page 14, paragraph 4 to page 17, paragraph 1).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/26/2007 with respect to the rejection of claims 49 under 35 USC 102, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments with respect to claim 49 (also applied to claim 63) that "Lewis does not disclose inputting a text document" due to "create a text document" from received audio signal" (the amendment: Remarks/Arguments, page 17, last paragraph), the

Art Unit: 2626

examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the additional functionality of speech recognition (speech to text) of LEWIS is **not** relevant to and/or prevented from the separate proofreading and correcting functionality for the rejection of the claimed limitations. Further, LEWIS discloses 'proofreading and correcting dictated **text**' as an input of the system in Fig. 3A and uses Microsoft Word for editing the text in Fig. 3G, which is properly read on the claimed/argued limitation.

In response to applicant's arguments with respect to claim 49 (also applied to claim 63) that "Lewis does not disclose conducting error-correcting functions to achieve reader comfort" (the amendment: Remarks/Arguments, page 18, paragraph 1), the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant and has a different view of prior art teachings and claim interpretations. It is noted that Lewis discloses '**selecting** proofreading criteria for identifying textual errors' (p9) and 'accepting a **user** (reader) **specified preference** (making reader comfort) to substitute the recommended change for the marked textual error' (p13), which is properly read on the claimed/argued limitation, based on broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim in light of the specification.

4. Regarding applicant's arguments filed on 02/26/2007 with respect to the rejection of claims 50-56 under 35 USC 103 (the amendment: Remarks/Arguments, page 18, paragraphs 2-3), the response to the arguments is directed to the corresponding claim rejection (see below), because the newly amended claims introduce new issue(s) and changes the scope of the claim(s), which are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection (see below).

Art Unit: 2626

5. In response to applicant's argument with respect to claims 57-62 rejected under 35 USC 103 with official notice, that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning (see the amendment: Remarks/Arguments, page 18, paragraph 4), it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In this case, based on broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim(s), in light of the specification, the claimed limitation is nothing more than editing/correcting a text by using a computer and word processing functions/tools (such as using Microsoft Word) based on certain grammatical and semantic knowledge in a user interactive manner. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to either combine different teachings by LEWIS himself or modify LEWIS to combine teachings of other well known prior art that provides common grammatical and semantic knowledge for a user in an interactive manner, for the purpose (motivation) of allowing a user to edit or rewrite a text with preferred text form/style by using a word processor, such Microsoft Words with its functions/toots which are so well known as to be used in daily life/work for students and professionals.

For further supporting the official notice, in this office action, the examiner provides two prior art references as additional evidences: KINKOPH ("How to Use Microsoft Office 2000", ISBN 0-672-31522-X) who discloses how to use Word with multiple functions/tools: including "Edit" with "Find" and "Replace" (page 86-87), "Selling and Grammar" checking (page 90-91),

Art Unit: 2626

“thesaurus” with “look up” list and “replace” with synonym (page 90-91), and “AutoCorrect” with “replace text” (page 92-93), which has all interactive capability of implementing the functionality as claimed; James et al. (“Writing an Speaking for Excellence”, ISBN 0867209356) hereinafter referenced as James who teaches better writhing with grammatical knowledge including using transitional word(s) in the beginning of the sentence (page 31, paragraph 2). The response to the applicant’s challenge for the official notice is directed to the corresponding claim rejections (see detail below).

Election/Restrictions

It is reminded that this response filed 02/26/2007 contains claims 1-48 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Specification

6. The amendment filed on 02/26/2007 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

a. Regarding the amendment of replacing the full paragraph on page 20 of the specification (see the amendment: page 2, paragraphs 1-2), the newly added content “For example, subroutine 114 would replace the sentence ...” introduces new matter into the

disclosure. This content cannot be added as part of the original specification. Based on the applicant's amendment, the examiner suggests modifying the claim to replace "removes boring "ing" words and results in the use of stronger verbs" with --removes word "responsible" and uses the verb form instead of the "ing" form of the followed word--.

b. Regarding the amendment of replacing the full paragraph on page 21 of the specification (see the amendment: page 2, paragraphs 4-5), the newly added content "Subroutine 122 presents another method that..." and "For example, the sentence...." introduces new matter into the disclosure.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. Claims 49 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LEWIS et al. (US 2002/0002459 A1) hereinafter referenced as LEWIS.

As per **claim 49**, LEWIS discloses 'method and system for proofreading and correcting dictated text' (title), comprising:

"a. inputting a text document to a computer system", (paragraph (hereinafter referenced as p) 7, 'text input'; Fig. 1 and p36, 'a typical computer system'; p9, 'dictated text contained in an electronic document (inputted text document)');

"b. conducting error-correcting functions to achieve clarity, conciseness and reader comfort' (p9, 'proofread and correct dictated text' (read on conducting error-correcting functions), 'selecting **proofreading** criteria for identifying textual errors'; p13, 'accepting a **user specified preference** to substitute the recommended change for the marked textual error',

Art Unit: 2626

(so as to achieve clarity, conciseness and reader comfort as claimed); p39, 'perform proofreading functions on the dictated text contained in the electronic document'); and,

"c. displaying said text document in a corrected form" (Fig.3G and p11, 'highlighting each the word contained in the electronic document' 'visually displaying each the highlighted word in the user interface'; p13, 'editing each the marked textural error', 'display the recommended change', which necessarily or inherently include displaying the text document in a corrected form).

As per **claim 63**, it recites an apparatus. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 49, because the claim includes the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 49, wherein, the claimed computer hardware components are included in LEWIS' disclosure (see LEWIS: Fig. 1 and p36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of Texas Association of Counties ("Job descriptions", May 12 1990) hereinafter referenced as R1.

As per **claim 50** (depending on claim 49), even though LEWIS discloses using proofreading criteria and grammar rules on the text (p9-p10) and Microsoft Word processor (Fig. 3G) that provides various editing (including finding, correcting and replacing) functions, LEWIS does not **exactly** disclose that "determining whether, in said text document, "responsible" followed by a gerund is present and, if present, for each said use of "responsible" replacing "responsible" with the verb form of said gerund." However, the feature of avoiding using some

Art Unit: 2626

particular word/term such as “responsible” in certain text is well known in the art as evidenced by R1, which discloses that ‘the term “responsible for” should not be used in listing the essential job function’ because it ‘is a vague term’ and does not give entailed duty; instead, ‘job duty should begin with an action verb’ (R1: page 2, sub-section D). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify LEWIS by providing an additional criteria/rule to use action verb instead of term “responsible for” for job duty related text, as taught by R1, for the purpose (motivation) of avoiding the vague term and providing clear indication of entailed duty in the text (R1: page 2, sub-section D).

In another view of LEWIS’ disclosure, LEWIS teaches using proofreading criteria and grammar rules on the text (p9-p10) and Microsoft Word (Fig. 3G) that provides various word processing functions, which inherently include editing functions of “Find” and “Replace” (under “Edit” of the menu bar), correction functions of “selling and grammar” and “autocorrect” (under “Tools” of the menu bar, which allow user to specify certain correcting/replacing criteria or rules), and other the related functions and options. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LEWIS’ teachings of using proofreading criteria and grammar rules, and various Microsoft Word editing/correcting functions stated above, to find, correct and/or replace any user specified term (including word “responsible”), for the purpose (motivation) of accepting a user specified preference (LEWIS: abstract). This means that combining teachings of LEWIS alone can also satisfy the claimed limitation.

In addition, in light of the specification, the claimed features can be broadly interpreted as a user interactively conducts editing/correcting functions (features) with a computer and word

Art Unit: 2626

processing tools (such as Microsoft Word), so that LEWIS' system, providing functionalities of editing, correcting, replacing, suggesting and displaying in an interactive manner (such as using Microsoft Word), has capability of the implementing the claimed features.

9. Claims 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of MARTIN ("Developing/Revising Detention Facility Policies and Procedures", June 1996).

As per **claim 51** (depending on claim 49), even though LEWIS discloses using proofreading criteria and grammar rules on the text (p9-p10) and Microsoft Word processor (Fig. 3G) that inherently provides various editing (including finding, correcting and replacing) functions, LEWIS does not **exactly** disclose that "determining whether, in said text document, "It" is present as the first word of a sentence and, if present, for each said sentence, replacing the word "It" with words describing to whom or to what "It" refers" However, the feature of avoiding using a particular word/term such as "It" at starting sentence well known in the art as evidenced by MARTIN who disclose a 'writing style checklist' (Appendix C) and teaches to 'avoid starting sentences with "It is," "There is," "There are", which usually can be changed to eliminate the extra words, and provides examples (page 22, section of "Mechanics"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify LEWIS by providing criteria/rule to change/replace certain term at starting sentences, such as "It is", "There is/are", as taught by MARTIN, for the purpose (motivation) of following guide of the writing style checklist and using simple word and eliminating extra words (MARTIN: pages 21-22).

In another view of LEWIS' disclosure, LEWIS teaches using proofreading criteria and grammar rules on the text (p9-p10) and Microsoft Word (Fig. 3G) that provides various word processing functions, which inherently include editing functions of "Find" and "Replace" (under "Edit" of the menu bar), correction functions of "selling and grammar" and "autocorrect" (under "Tools" of the menu bar, which allow user to specify certain correcting/replacing criteria or rules), and other the related functions and options. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LEWIS' teachings of using proofreading criteria and grammar rules, and various Microsoft Word editing/correcting functions stated above, to find, correct and/or replace any user specified term (including word "responsible"), for the purpose (motivation) of accepting a user specified preference (LEWIS: abstract). This means that combining teachings of LEWIS alone can also satisfy the claimed limitation.

In addition, in light of the specification, the claimed features can be broadly interpreted as a user interactively conducts editing/correcting functions (features) with a computer and word processing tools (such as Microsoft Word), so that LEWIS' system, providing functionalities of editing, correcting, replacing, suggesting and displaying in an interactive manner (such as using Microsoft Word), has capability of the implementing the claimed features.

As per **claim 52** (depending on claim 49), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 51, because the rejection for claim 51 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 52.

Art Unit: 2626

10. Claims 53-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of SARAKI et al. (US 5,903,858) hereinafter referenced as SARAKI.

As per **claim 53** (depending on claim 49), even though LEWIS discloses using proofreading criteria and grammar rules on the text (p9-p10) and Microsoft Word (Fig. 3G) that inherently provides various word processing functions (such as finding, correcting and replacing), including the optional function to trigger a condition of “successive prepositional phrases (more than three)” (see Microsoft Word: “Tools” in menu bar > “options...” in the menu > “Spelling & Grammar” tab > “Settings...” button), which is read on the claimed condition “when said sentence includes three or more consecutive prepositional phrases”, LEWIS does not expressly disclose “moving one of said prepositional phrases to the beginning of a sentence”. However, the feature of moving prepositional phrase to a different position including the beginning of a sentence, is well known in the art as evidenced by SARAKI who discloses ‘translation machine for editing an original text by rewriting the same and translating the rewrote one’ (title), comprising multiple levels of analysis modules and ‘rewriting rules’ (col. 9-14), and teaches that ‘the inserted adverbial clause (including prepositional phrase) is moved to the beginning of the sentence’ and ‘the word order of ...the preposition phrase is changed’ (col. 14, lines 29-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify LEWIS by providing changing the word order of a preposition phrase in a sentence, as taught by SARAKI, for the purpose (motivation) of rewriting or editing the text to a simple text based on rewriting rules (SARAKI: abstract).

In another view of LEWIS’ disclosure, LEWIS teaches using proofreading criteria and grammar rules on the text (p9-p10) and Microsoft Word (Fig. 3G) that inherently provides

Art Unit: 2626

various word processing functions, including editing functions of “Find” and “Replace”, correction functions of “Selling and Grammar”, “Autocorrect” and setting a trigger of “successive prepositional phrases”, as stated above, which allow user to specify testing/correcting/replacing criteria or rules. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LEWIS’ teachings of using proofreading criteria and grammar rules, and various Microsoft Word processing functions/features, to test, find, correct and/or rewrite a user specified condition or term (such as condition of “successive prepositional phrases”), for the purpose (motivation) of accepting a user specified preference (LEWIS: abstract), particularly in an environment of requiring highly interactive and/or subjective actions from user. This means that combining teachings by LEWIS alone has capability of implementing functionality as the claimed.

As per **claim 54** (depending on claim 53), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 53, because the rejection for claim 53 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 54, wherein the teaching that ‘the word order of ...the preposition phrase is changed’ (SARAKI: col. 14, lines 29-34) is applicable to move suitable “location-expressing prepositional phrase” as claimed.

As per **claim 55** (depending on claim 49), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 53, because the rejection for claim 53 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 55. In addition, SARAK discloses that using ‘the first aspect...’ replace ‘according to one aspect ...’ (SARAKI: col. 14, lines 57-61), which further suggests that the combined teachings provide capability of implementing functionality as claimed.

As per **claim 56** (depending on claim 49), LEWIS does not exactly disclose that “when a sentence includes both a weak verb and a gerund, said error-correcting functions comprise replacing said weak verb with the verb form of said gerund”. However, the feature of replacing said weak verb with the verb form of said gerund is well known in the art as evidenced by SARAHI who discloses ‘translation machine for editing an original text by rewriting the same and translating the rewrote one’ (title), comprising multiple levels of analysis modules and ‘rewriting rules’ (col. 9-14), recognizing syntax component, such as ‘gerund’ and ing-form of verb, and providing the corresponding rewriting rules (col. 10, line 12 and col. 11, lines 28-47), which suggests that the system has capability of implementing functionality as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify LEWIS by providing analyzing sentence structure and rewriting rules, including processing gerund and ing-form of verbs, as taught by SARAHI, for the purpose (motivation) of rewriting or editing the text to a simple text based on a rewriting rule (SARAHI: abstract).

11. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of SARAHI as applied to claim 56, and further in view of KINKOPH (“How to Use Microsoft Office 2000”, ISBN 0-672-31522-X).

As per **claim 57** (depending on claim 56), LEWIS in view of SARAHI does not expressly disclose “referring to a verb lookup list”. However, the feature of referring to a lookup list of certain type of words (such as verbs) is well known in the art as evidenced by KINKOPH who discloses how to use Word with multiple functions/tools: including “Edit” with “Find” and

Art Unit: 2626

“Replace” (page 86-87), “Selling and Grammar” checking (page 90-91), “thesaurus” with “look up” list (include verb lookup list) and “replace” with synonym (page 90-91), and “AutoCorrect” with “replace text” (page 92-93), which has all interactive capability of implementing the functionality as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LEWIS in view of SARAHI with KINKOPH by providing various word processing functions including verb lookup list for editing/correcting text in a user interactive manner, for the purpose (motivation) of allowing a user to edit or rewrite a text with user preferred text form/style.

In addition, based on broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim(s), in light of the specification, the claimed limitation is nothing more than editing/correcting a text by using a computer and word processing functions/tools (such as using Microsoft Word) based on certain grammatical and/or semantic knowledge in a user interactive manner. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine different teachings of LEWIS and SARAHI by providing Microsoft Words that inherently includes various word processing functions (including verb lookup list), as suggested by LEWIS, for the purpose (motivation) of allowing a user to edit or rewrite a text with preferred text form/style, which means combining teachings of LEWIS and SARAHI can also satisfied the claimed limitation for the rejection.

12. Claims 58 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of KINKOPH.

As per **claim 58** (depending on claim 49), LEWIS does not expressly disclose “when a noun in a prepositional phrase interposed between a sentences subject and verb is capable of action, said error correcting functions comprise making said noun the subject of said sentence, and deriving a substitute verb from what said subject does”, which is nothing more than editing/correcting a text by using a computer and word processing functions/tools with some grammatical knowledge in a user interactive manner, based on broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim(s) in light of the specification. However, the feature of rewriting a sentence by using word processing functions with some grammatical knowledge in a user interactive manner is well known in the art However as evidenced by KINKOPH who discloses how to use Word with multiple functions/tools: including “Edit” with “Find” and “Replace” (page 86-87), “Selling and Grammar” checking (page 90-91), “thesaurus” with “look up” list (capable of including lookup list of verb, transition, and other type of words) and “replace” with synonym (page 90-91), and “AutoCorrect” with “replace text” (page 92-93), which has all interactive capability of implementing the functionality as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LEWIS with KINKOPH by providing various word processing functions/tools with grammatical knowledge for editing/correcting text in a user interactive manner, for the purpose (motivation) of allowing a user to edit or rewrite a text with user preferred text form/style.

As per **claim 62** (depending on claim 49), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 57, because the claim recites similar limitation as claim 57.

Art Unit: 2626

13. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of James et al. ("Writing an Speaking for Excellence", ISBN 0867209356) hereinafter referenced as James.

As per **claim 59** (depending on claim 49), LEWIS does not expressly disclose "when a transition word is between a sentence's subject and verb, said error-correcting functions comprise moving said transition word to the beginning of said sentence". However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by James who teaches better writhing with grammatical knowledge including using transitional word(s) in the beginning of the sentence (page 31, paragraph 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LEWIS and James by providing word processing functions for editing/correcting text in a user interactive manner and using some grammatical knowledge, such as using transitional word(s) in the beginning of the sentence, for the purpose (motivation) of allowing a user to edit or rewrite a text with user preferred text form/style.

14. Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of James as applied to claim 59, and further in view of KINKOPH.

As per **claim 60** (depending on claim 59), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 57, because the rejection for claim 57 covers the same or similar limitation as claim 60.

15. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of MARTIN and KINKOPH.

Art Unit: 2626

As per **claim 61** (depending on claim 49), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 51 and 58, because the rejection for claims 51 and 58 covers the same or similar limitation as claim 61.

16. Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LEWIS in view of R1, MARTIN, SARAHI, James and KINKOPH.

As per **claim 64** (depending on claim 49), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 50-53, 56, 59 and 61, because the claims recites the same or similar limitations as claims 50-53, 56, 59 and 61 and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify LEWIS' Microsoft Word based editor/processor by combining using various editing functions with different grammatical and/or semantic knowledge from the multiple references, for the purpose (motivation) of allowing user to select a preferred form/style for correcting/rewriting a text.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

Art Unit: 2626

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

18. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richmond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
April 25, 2007


RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER